

REMARKS

Claims 16, 24 to 27, 29, 30, 45 to 49, 51 and 52 are pending in the application. Claims 16 and 45 are independent.¹ Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, the foregoing claim amendments are believed to address the §112, first paragraph, rejections found on page 3 of the Office Action.

Turning to the art rejections, independent claim 16 was rejected over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0192200 (Karabinis). Independent claim 16 therefore now recites:

16. A method, performed by a central station, of allocating satellite network resources in a satellite communication system comprising remote stations coupled to the central station by a satellite network, wherein different remote stations are located in different geographic areas, the method comprising:
establishing information about available satellite network resources for one or more of the geographic areas;
publishing the information for access by remote stations in the one or more geographic areas;
receiving, from a remote station, a notification indicating that at least some of the satellite network resources have been seized by the remote station;
updating the information about available satellite network resources to reflect seizing by the remote station; and
communicating the updated information only to remote stations in the one or more geographic areas;
wherein the information comprises at least one of static and dynamic information; and
wherein an updated version of the static information is published less frequently than an updated version of the dynamic information.

Karabinis is not understood to disclose or to suggest at least the foregoing underlined features of claim 16. Regarding the “receiving” performed in claim 1, the Office Action states the following:

¹ The Examiner is urged to independently confirm this recitation of the pending claims.

channels so the list is sent to (i.e. published) radioterminal); receiving, from a remote station, a notification indicating that at least some of the satellite network resources have been seized by the remote station (Par.65 lines 5-12); updating the list of

However, as we understand it, Karabinis does not describe that a notification is received from a remote station. Instead, Karabinis describes that the base station monitors activity on channels to determine if a channel has been seized. This is shown in the highlighted excerpt from Karabinis below.

[0065] The source radioterminal may pick one of the available channels and may send a message on that channel. The choice of channel may be made by the radioterminal randomly, pseudo-randomly and/or in a predetermined way.

The base station may be monitoring a measure of activity on all channels of the available channels list and may thus detect that a particular channel of the available channels list has been seized by a radioterminal. The base station may,

upon detection that a particular channel of the available channels list has been seized, delete that channel from the available channels list and accordingly update the available channels list broadcast. In contrast to the above channel assignment methodology, FIG. 3B illustrates an alternate protocol whereby the source radioterminal, following activation of its PtS function, requests channel assignment from the system.

Accordingly, as we understand it, Karabinis does not disclose or suggest receiving, from a remote station, a notification indicating that at least some of the satellite network resources have been seized by the remote station.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the applied art. Amended independent claim 45 is likewise believed to be patentable.

Dependent claims are also believed to define patentable features. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

Applicants: Thomas Earle Goerke, et al.
Serial No. : 10/554,125
Filed : July 12, 2006
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 19914-002US1
Client Ref.: RQ05-1411

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, we respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown above. Telephone calls regarding this application should be directed to 617-521-7896.

Please apply any fee shortage or excess to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 19914-002US1.

Respectfully submitted,

June 23, 2011
Date: _____

/Paul Pysher/

Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780